

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 14, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 10-20 are allowed. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 stand rejected. Claim 5 stands objected to. Claim 5 has been canceled.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for finding Claims 10-20 allowable. Claims 12, 13, 16 and 18 have been amended for clarity and to correct informalities. No new matter has been added.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,213,338 to Hardy (hereinafter referred to as "Hardy") is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a system for dispensing a liquid, the system including "a reservoir comprising a plurality of apertures disposed therein; and at least one dispenser in flow communication with said reservoir, said dispenser comprising a first and a second tube operatively coupled to said reservoir, said at least one dispenser further comprising a body comprising a trough and a cover pivotably coupled to said body and configured to dispense the liquid when said cover is in the open position."

Claim 1 now incorporates the recitations of Claim 5. Claim 5 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is solicited.

Claims 2 and 8 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2 and 8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2 and 8 likewise are patentable over Hardy.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 8 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,013,568 to Getchell et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Getchell”) is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent Claim 1, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 3 and 4 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 3 and 4 likewise are patentable over Hardy in view of Getchell.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,401 to Wunderlich et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Wunderlich”) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from independent Claim 1, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 7 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 7 likewise is patentable over Hardy in view of Wunderlich.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 7 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claim 5 is respectfully traversed. By the above amendment, such basis for objection is believed to have been obviated or rendered no longer applicable and notification to that effect is solicited.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Krischke

Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070